



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/063,595	05/03/2002	Dan L. Eaton	10466/361	2710
30313	7590	06/24/2004	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614			WEGERT, SANDRA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1647	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/063,595	Applicant(s) EATON ET AL.	
	Examiner Sandra Wegert	Art Unit 1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/13/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 May 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/13/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

Status of Application, Amendments, and/or Claims

The Preliminary Amendment, submitted 9 September 2002, and the Information Disclosure Statement, submitted 13 September 2002, have been entered. Claims 1-6 have been entered.

Claims 1-6 are under examination in the Instant Application.

Informalities

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

URL's

The disclosure is objected to because it contains browser-executable code. This occurs, for example, in paragraph 206. All URL's should be removed from the Specification. Applicant may refer to web sites by non-executable name only. See MPEP § 608.01 (p).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections/Objections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101 and 35 USC § 112, first paragraph

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 101:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1647

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks a credible, specific and substantial asserted utility or a well-established utility.

The claims are directed to antibodies made against the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 88 (see Specification: Figure 88, *PRO1270* or *DNA66308-1537*). Further limiting claims are presented to monoclonal antibodies, humanized antibodies, antibody fragments, labeled antibodies, and antibodies that bind "specifically" to the polypeptide. However, the specification does not disclose a function for the antibodies against SEQ ID NO: 88, in the context of the cell or organism.

The instant Specification indicates that the protein of SEQ ID NO: 88 is a secreted protein with a variety of functions:

"Secreted proteins have various industrial applications, including as pharmaceuticals, diagnostics, biosensors and bioreactors. Most protein drugs available at present, such as thrombolytic agents, interferons, interleukins, erythropoietins, colony stimulating factors, and various other cytokines, are secretory proteins. Their receptors, which are membrane proteins, also have potential as therapeutic or diagnostic agents. Efforts are being undertaken by both industry and academia to identify new, native secreted proteins. Many efforts are focused on the screening of mammalian recombinant DNA libraries to identify the coding sequences for novel secreted proteins." (paragraph 4).

No well-established utility exists for newly isolated complex biological molecules. However, the specification implies that the following are credible, specific and substantial patentable utilities for the claimed antibodies:

- 1) In assays to screen for compounds capable of modifying the interaction between receptor and ligand.

Art Unit: 1647

- 2) To bind the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 88.
- 3) To develop drugs for the treatment or prevention of polypeptide deficiency.
- 4) To treat cancer.

Each of these shall be addressed in turn.

1) in assays to screen for compounds capable of modifying the interaction between receptor and ligand. This asserted utility is credible and substantial but not specific. Such can be performed for any receptor-ligand pair. Additionally, the specification discloses nothing specific or substantial for the compounds that can be identified by this method.

2) To bind the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 88. This asserted utility is credible and substantial, but not specific. Antibodies can be made to any polypeptide. However, if the specification discloses nothing specific and substantial about the polypeptide, both the polypeptide and its antibodies have no patentable utility.

3) to develop drugs for the treatment or prevention of polypeptide deficiency. This asserted utility is credible and specific, however, it is not substantial. The specification does not disclose any conditions wherein there is a deficiency of the polypeptides encoded by the claimed polynucleotides. Significant further experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to identify individuals who would benefit from such a drug, and then to determine a best course of treatment. There is no disclosure, for example, of dosages, nor how to assay for improvement or intolerable levels of side effects, etc. Since this asserted utility is not presented in mature form, so that it could be readily used in a real world sense, the asserted utility is not substantial.

Art Unit: 1647

4) *To treat cancer.* The Specification implies that antagonists (e.g., antibodies) directed against the protein encoded by DNA66308-1537 (PRO1270) would be expected to have utility in cancer therapy.

Paragraph 495 appears to list the results of tissue expression experiments:

"upregulation of Molecule expression in: as compared to: DNA66308-1537 normal lung/lung tumor."

However, the specification discloses a single tissue that expresses the PRO1270 polypeptide without listing the level of expression or the expression relative to other tissues. Furthermore the Applicant implies that this expression pattern supports a function for the PRO1270 polypeptide in the treatment of cancer. However, evidence of mere expression in a tissue is not tantamount to a showing of a role for the disclosed polynucleotide encoding the claimed polypeptide. It is not clear if expression of the PRO1270 polypeptide is correlated with a specific change in physiology, for example, or with any cancer or proliferative disease.

Furthermore, although the specification teaches that PRO1270 may be expressed more highly in normal lung, the state of the art is such that protein expression levels cannot be accurately predicted from the level of corresponding mRNA transcript, and therefore cannot be correlated to antibody binding. Haynes et al, for example, studied 80 proteins relatively homogeneous in half-life and expression level, and found no strong correlation between protein and transcript levels (Haynes et al., 1998, Electrophoresis 19:1862-1872). That research group found that for some genes, equivalent mRNA levels translated into protein abundances which varied by more than 50-fold (pg. 1863, paragraph 2, Figure 1). Therefore, one skilled in the art cannot predict that the PRO1270 mRNA transcript levels measured in cancerous tissues are

Art Unit: 1647

indicative of PRO1270 polypeptide expression in cancerous cells. Undue experimentation is required by the skilled artisan to detect and quantify PRO1270 polypeptide expression in all possible tumor tissues/cells, other than lung cancer.

Claims 1-6 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific and substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention. Thus, because the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 88 has not been shown to be useful, antibodies made against the polypeptide also have no specific use. Applicants have implied that the PRO1270 polypeptide is a secreted protein. Regardless of whether the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 88 is a secreted protein, no specific function has been assigned to the polypeptide. Therefore an antibody that specifically binds the protein of SEQ ID NO 349 would likewise have no specific function.

Generally, the art acknowledges that function cannot be predicted based solely on structural similarity to a protein found in the sequence databases. For example, Skolnick et al. (2000, Trends in Biotech. 18:34-39) state that knowing the protein structure by itself is insufficient to annotate a number of functional classes, and is also insufficient for annotating the specific details of protein function (see Box 2, p. 36). Similarly, Bork (2000, Genome Research 10:398-400) states that the error rate of functional annotations in the sequence database is considerable, making it even more difficult to infer correct function from a structural comparison of a new sequence with a sequence database (see especially p. 399). Such concerns are also echoed by Doerks et al. (1998, Trends in Genetics 14:248-250) who state that (1) functional

Art Unit: 1647

information is only partially annotated in the database, ignoring multi functionality, resulting in underpredictions of functionality of a new protein and (2) overpredictions of functionality occur because structural similarity often does not necessarily coincide with functional similarity.

Examples from the secreted polypeptide art demonstrate, in some cases, polypeptides with high homology having a wide-variety of functions in organisms (see Hesselgesser, et al, 1997, Methods in Enzymology, 287: 59-69, see pages 59 and 64-66) and in other cases, many different possible structures for secreted proteins that are considered related as to function (Blease, et al, 2000, Resp. Res., 1(1): 54-61). However, Applicants have not associated the disclosed PRO1270 polypeptide with any type or genus of polypeptide.

Based on the discussions above concerning the specific examples of structurally similar proteins that have different functions, along with the art's recognition that one cannot rely upon structural similarity alone to determine functionality, the specification fails to teach the skilled artisan how to use the claimed antibodies against PRO1270 without resorting to undue experimentation to determine what the specific biological activities of the PRO1270 polypeptide are.

The specification does not teach the skilled artisan how to use the claimed antibodies directed to the polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 88 for any purpose. For example, there is no disclosure of particular disease states correlating to an alteration in levels or forms of the polypeptide such that the claimed antibody could be used as a diagnostic tool. The skilled artisan is not provided with sufficient guidance to use the claimed antibodies for any purpose.

Art Unit: 1647

Due to the large quantity of experimentation necessary to determine an activity or property of the disclosed polypeptide such that it can be determined how to use the claimed antibodies directed against SEQ ID NO: 88 and to screen for activity, the lack of direction/guidance presented in the specification regarding same, the absence of working examples directed to same, the complex nature of the invention, the state of the prior art establishing that biological activity cannot be predicted based on structural similarity to other similar polypeptides, the unpredictability of the effects of mutation on protein structure and function, and the breadth of the claims which fail to recite particular biological activities- undue experimentation would be required of the skilled artisan to make and/or use the claimed invention in its full scope.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites an antibody that binds a protein. Claim 6 recites an antibody that "specifically binds to" the same protein. Neither the Specification nor the art provides unambiguous definitions for "binds" and "specifically binds;" therefore, the metes and bounds of the claims cannot be determined by one skilled in the art. Furthermore, since antibodies are generally seen as binding antigens with both high affinity *and* high specificity, it is not known what additional characteristics would be displayed by an antibody binding "specifically."

Art Unit: 1647

Conclusion: Claims 1-6 are rejected for the reasons recited above.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Wegert whose telephone number is (571) 272-0895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern Time). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached at (571) 272-0887.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SLW
6/21/04

Elizabeth C. Kemmerer

ELIZABETH KEMMERER
PRIMARY EXAMINER